

# DRAFT

**TOWN OF GILBERT  
PLANNING COMMISSION STUDY SESSION  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
50 E. CIVIC CENTER DRIVE  
GILBERT, AZ  
AUGUST 2, 2017**

**COMMISSION PRESENT:** Chairman Kristofer Sippel  
Vice Chairman Brian Andersen (arrived late)  
Commissioner David Cavenee  
Commissioner Greg Froehlich  
Commissioner Brian Johns (arrived late)  
Commissioner Joshua Oehler (arrived late)  
Alternate Commissioner Seth Banda (sat on dais)  
Alternate Commissioner Mary Harris (sat on dais)

**COMMISSION ABSENT:** Commissioner Carl Bloomfield

**STAFF PRESENT:** Bob Caravona, Senior Planner  
Ashlee MacDonald, Planner II  
Nichole McCarty, Planner II  
Gilbert Olgin, Planner II  
Amy Temes, Senior Planner  
Principal Planner Catherine Lorbeer

**ALSO PRESENT:** Attorney Nancy Davidson  
Council Liaison Brigitte Peterson  
Recorder Debbie Frazey

---

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Kristofer Sippel called the August 2 Study Session of the Planning Commission to order at 5:04 p.m.

- 1. Z17-1005, RIGGS EXTRA SPACE STORAGE: REQUEST TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 6.45 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF E. RIGGS ROAD AND S. 164<sup>TH</sup> STREET FROM NEIGHBORHOOD OFFICE (NO) ZONING DISTRICT TO GENERAL**

Town of Gilbert Planning Commission  
Study Session August 2, 2017

**COMMERICAL (GC) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED DEVELOPMENT OVERLAY. A. GP17-1005, RAY ROAD STORAGE: REQUEST FOR MINOR GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO CHANGE THE LAND USE CLASSIFICATION OF APPROXIMATELY 3 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY GENERALLY LOCATED AT SOUTHWEST CORNER OF RAY ROAD AND CORONADO ROAD FROM NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL (NC) LAND USE CLASSIFICATION TO GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) LAND USE CLASSIFICATION.**

**Z17-1010, RAY ROAD STORAGE: REQUEST TO AMEND ORDINANCE NOS. 1159 AND 1325 PERTAINING TO THE FINCHER FARMS PAD BY REMOVING APPROXIMATELY 3 ACRES OF REAL PROPERTY ZONED NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL (NC) ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY AND REZONING TO APPROXIMATELY 3 ACRES OF GENERAL COMMERCIAL (GC) OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICT WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.**

Planner Gilbert Olgin began his presentation on Riggs Extra Space Storage. He shared a location map, noting the location of the subject site at the southwest corner of Ray Road and Santan Village Parkway. He said more specifically, it fronts Ray Road to the north and Coronado Road to the west. He said there were two cases before the Commission. The first was a request for a Minor General Plan Amendment to change the Land Use Classification from Neighborhood Commercial (NC) to General Commercial (GC). The second request was for a rezoning from Neighborhood Commercial (NC) with a PAD to General Commercial (GC) with a PAD overlay. Planner Olgin said the site is approximately 3 acres of property and is surrounded by residential development to the north, west and south. He shared that there are existing apartments to the east of the subject site. He indicated that the owner's intent is to bring a storage facility use to the site. He then reviewed the site history. He stated that this property has been vacant for over 20 years. He said it is an isolated commercial piece. Planner Olgin then discussed the two modifications that are being asked for, noting that while the proposed project will be designed to comply with all development standards of the GC zoning district, the applicant is requesting a PAD overlay in order to secure additional standards for the benefit of the surrounding community. In addition to the base standards in the GC zoning district, this rezoning application proposes the following modifications:

- The maximum building height shall be limited to 32 ft.; LDC normally allows up to 45 ft.
- A double row of evergreen trees, fifty (50) percent minimum 24" box size trees and fifty (50) percent minimum 36" box size trees shall be planted twenty-five (25) ft. on center within the commercial parcel landscape set back adjacent to residential uses. (This modification was carried forward from the PAD Ordinance No. 1159.)

#### **Project Data Table**

<b>Site Development Regulations</b>	<b>Required per Ord. No. 1159</b>	<b>Required per LDC – GC Zoning</b>	<b>Proposed GC PAD Zoning</b>
-------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------

Town of Gilbert Planning Commission  
Study Session August 2, 2017

Maximum Building Height (ft.) / (Stories)	30'/1	45'	32'
	<b>Required per LDC – NC Zoning</b>	<b>Required per LDC – GC Zoning</b>	<b>Proposed GC PAD Zoning</b>
Minimum Step-Back	No	Yes	Yes
Minimum Setback			
Front	20'	25'	25'
Side (Street)	15'	20'	20'
Side to residential	15'	75'	75'
Side to non-residential	10'	20'	20'
Rear to residential	15'	75'	75'
Separation between Buildings(ft.) Multiple Story	--	20'	20'
Minimum Required Perimeter Landscape Area (ft.)			
Front	20'	25'	25'
Side (Street)	15'	20'	20'
Side to Residential	15'	40'	40'
Side to non-residential	10'	20'	20'
Rear to residential	15'	40'	40'

Planner Olgin finished his presentation and requested input from the Commission.

Chair Sippel thanked Gilbert Olgin for his presentation and called for questions or comments.

Comment: David Cavenee said that with this proposed facility so close to existing residential, he would want to make sure that the elevations are very attractive and that this project doesn't look as industrial as a typical storage facility normally does. He said it might need to be a bit more residential in nature, with types of finishes and look and feel. He said he likes the fact that they are increasing their landscaping. He said he would have recommended that and especially thinks it would be important particularly around the south and west border. He also suggested that they landscape the area near the apartments to the east pretty heavily. He said he didn't have any concerns with the height request as it was only a 2' difference. He stated that he didn't think that would be noticeable, but he understood why they might need the increased height. He said he thinks it is a good use for a site that has sat dormant for this long. He said he can support the idea, but he would certainly recommend that when this comes forward during Design Review, that they focus on the details.

**2. Z17-1007 LDC TEXT AMEND BATCH G: DISCUSSION OF AMENDMENT TO THE TOWN OF GILBERT LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE, CHAPTER I ZONING REGULATIONS, DIVISION 1: GENERAL PROVISIONS, DIVISION 2: LAND USE DESIGNATIONS, DIVISION 3: OVERLAY ZONING DISTRICTS, DIVISION 4: GENERAL REGULATIONS, DIVISION 5: ADMINISTRATION, AND DIVISION 6: USE DEFINITIONS; CHAPTER II DESIGN STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES; CHAPTER III: SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS, GLOSSARY OF GENERAL TERMS, APPENDIX 1: GRAPHICS AND THE TOWN OF GILBERT ZONING MAP.**

Senior Planner Amy Temes began her presentation on Z17-1007, LDC Text Amend Batch G. She told the Planning Commission that she is bringing forward four of the items that she presented last month when the Commission initiated the text amendment. She said this effort was an attempt to clarify some of the regulations, some of which are overregulated or have conflicting regulations, and in some cases, to provide updated information. She said as they hear applicants ask the same questions over the years, they often realize these questions need to be addressed. Planner Temes indicated that this Study Session will focus on amendment items 2, 3, 4 and 8.

1. Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Overlay District
- 2. Residential Side Clear Area – 8/2/2017**
- 3. Driveway and Apron Parking Access – 8/2/2017**
- 4. Minor Land Divisions and Minor Subdivisions – 8/2/2017**
5. Internal Commercial Setbacks
6. Rear Industrial Landscape Areas
7. Off-Street Parking Requirements
- 8. Use Permit Expiration Date – 8/2/2017**

Planner Temes said she would like to briefly address each item and then receive feedback from the Commission on each item before she discusses the next item. She then discussed the Residential Side Clear Area. She said that in the LDC there is a requirement that a 5' side clear area shall be maintained on both sides of all single family lots. This clear area must remain unobstructed from permanent construction such as air conditioners, pool equipment, fireplaces, or outdoor barbeque areas, including covered structures such as patios or porches. She shared a visual that showed what the difference would look like between the currently required 5' and the proposed 3'. She said the 5' clear came about a long time ago, based on homeowners not being able to fit things in their side yards, so this requirement ensured there was access for the owners of the property, as well as firefighters and any others that needed to access the rear yard without obstruction. She stated that trash containers are approximately 28" so they would extend into the 3' clear, but she pointed out that trash containers are not considered permanent structures, because they can be moved. The wording of the proposed amendment is as follows:

**Proposed Zoning Code Amendment**

Chapter 1 Zoning Regulations, Division 2 Land Use Designations, Article 2.1 Single Family Residential, Section 2.104 Lot Development Regulations is hereby amended to read as follows

Town of Gilbert Planning Commission  
Study Session August 2, 2017

(additions in ALL CAPS UNDERLINE; deletions in strikeout):

## **2.104 Lot Development Regulations**

### **D. *Side Setback.***

4. *Side Clear Area.* A minimum 35 foot side clear area shall be maintained on both sides of all single family lots, except for the common wall property line of attached dwellings in the SF-A district. The minimum 35 foot side clear area in the SF-D district may extend onto the adjacent lot. This clear area extends along the entire length of both side elevations to a point 5 feet behind the rear wall plane. (SEE APPENDIX 1, FIGURE 1) This area shall be free of permanent obstructions, including covered structures such as patios or porches, mechanical equipment, permanent outdoor fireplaces and barbeques, walls, fences, accessory structures, *OTARDs, Large Satellite Dish Antennas, Amateur Radio Facilities* including support structures and cables, swimming pool equipment, and other similar permanent obstructions. The clear area shall extend from the ground to a point 7 feet above ground. The only permanent obstructions permitted are:
  - a. Return walls, provided that one side return wall shall contain a minimum 36 inch wide gate;
  - b. Architectural building elements extending no more than 6 inches from the wall plane;
  - c. Gas, electric and other utility meters and equipment;
  - d. Landscape irrigation valves and control boxes; and
  - e. Window wells, provided that they are at grade and covered with grills, covers, screens or similar devices.

Planner Temes asked for input regarding the possibility of reducing the 5' side clear to a 3' clear.

Question: David Cavenee asked to clarify that they were not suggesting that they would reduce the physical distance between the structure and the property line, but just the clearance distance. He asked if that would mean that 5' would still be the minimum distance between wall to home but he sought clarification if this change would mean that they could have permanent features within 2' of that. He asked if his understanding was correct or if the wall could come to within 3' of the home.

Answer: Amy Temes answered that this change was not related to the side setback, so the side setback would continue to be 5', but there would be a 3' clear within that 5' setback, leaving 2' available for equipment. She also pointed out that if you had a 7' side yard, you would still have 4' available. However, she said that a property could request through a PAD a 3' side yard. In that case, the 3' side yard would be 3' clear and there would be nothing allowed within that side

clear. She said they do have zero lot lines, but in most cases that comes with a Use Benefit Easement and that is a different conversation.

Question/Comment: David Cavenee reiterated that Planner Temes was saying that the setback would stay the same, but clarified that a reduction in the setback could be sought as a variance. He said that the reason he asks is that he is a little sensitive to having homes 6' apart from each other. He said if both neighbors narrowed their setbacks to 3', the homes would only be 6' apart from each other. He said with an overhang, that would nearly make them touch and that would be a concern to him. He said if the Town's Fire Department is satisfied with having a clearance of 3' and Staff is vigilant in not allowing the setback to diminish to below 5' in most cases, he could support it. He said he is just really concerned that they will be putting homes so close together.

Answer: Amy Temes said they were not looking at trying to move homes closer together. She said that is not what they are trying to address in this text amendment. She indicated that the setbacks will remain as they are and if one was reduced to a 3' setback, it would be through a PAD, and the Planning Commission would have the opportunity to decide whether that should occur or not. However, she said that in the 10 years she has been with the Town, it has been her observation that you either have a 5' minimum side yard or you have a zero lot line. These are the two things that tend to occur, and then they have a Use Benefit Easement that extends to the other side to address some of the cluster products that they have. She reiterated that they are definitely not going down the path of suggesting 3' side yards.

Question: Mary Harris asked what the objective of this change was.

Answer: Amy Temes said the objective is to allow more room on the side of the home for equipment and other permanent structures or pop-outs that could occur in that area.

Question: Joshua Oehler said that he didn't get to see the entire presentation as he had just arrived, so Amy Temes might have covered this already, but he asked if a study had been undertaken to see what this would look like overall, in terms of whether taking away this 2' would result in still having enough space from a clearance perspective. He said he understands where they are going with this and he likes the idea, but he wants to make sure the 3' isn't constraining them.

Answer: Amy Temes said that they went to the 3' because that is the size of a standard gate width. If a trash container can be fit through a gate and you can walk through a gate, you should be able to access a yard. Going less than that would probably make the area too narrow to provide accessibility. She said the proposed 3' was an amount everyone could agree on without a large amount of discussion. She said the result of this for a 5' setback wouldn't be that substantial, other than the possibility of placing some pool equipment, as well as supporting equipment for outdoor solar roof panels.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he agrees with that, but it does bring up all the other pieces of equipment that still cannot fit in the area, specifically air conditioners, and he doesn't see what the addition of the 2' would really be providing. He said he doesn't think most pool equipment could fit within 2'.

Response: Amy Temes said it was important to remember that a lot of yards in Gilbert have 7' side yards and in those larger side yards, this would start to make an impact as you move up in the lot sizes.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he was surprised that they have this. He said he doesn't personally do very much residential, but he said he doesn't know of many other municipalities that even have this clearance requirement. He said he appreciated that they weren't looking at actually changing setbacks. He said he thinks he could support this, but wonders if they are doing enough to get other equipment into these side yards.

Planner Temes then discussed Driveways and Aprons Parking Access. She said they want to clarify the way in which they measure the length of a driveway. It is either from the back of sidewalk to the face of the garage door or from the back of curb to the face of the garage door if a sidewalk does not exist. She said the requirement is that the driveway must be 20' free and clear. She said they have tried to think of every scenario that someone could come forward with, but noted that this is difficult to do, because they have very creative applicants. The second change refers to a side entry garage. She said that currently, Code does not speak to the length of driveway required for a side entry garage. She said that they do not want a driveway length that could potentially block a sidewalk or block a street. In an effort to avoid this, they would like to apply the same requirement to side entry garages. Thirdly, Planner Temes said they would like clarification that a driveway is allowed off of an alley, tract, easement or private drive. She said this has provided confusion for a number of applicants over the years. They want to make it clear that an alley can have a driveway, but it has to be 20' so that a vehicle cannot hang off into the alley. Staff would also like to make it clear that when a garage is accessed directly from that alley, tract, easement or private drive, that there be a 3' apron and then the face of the garage door. She said that 3' provides visibility as someone pulls out of their garage. She said that Staff recommends the apron length of 3 feet be specified by deleting the word "minimum" in order to discourage inappropriate and unsafe parallel parking that might occur on an apron larger than 3'. She provided several graphics to help the Commission understand Staff's concerns. The proposed changes are listed below:

### **Proposed Zoning Code Amendment**

Chapter 1 Zoning Regulations, Division 4 General Regulations, Article 4.2 Off Street Parking and Loading Regulations, Section 4.207 Parking Access is hereby amended to read as follows (additions in ALL CAPS UNDERLINE; deletions in strikeout):

## **4.207 Parking Access**

### **B. *Residential Uses.***

1. On public or private streets where a residential garage or carport is directly accessible from the street, it shall have a paved driveway not less than 20 feet in length, measured from the back of sidewalk. If no sidewalk exists, the driveway length shall be measured FROM THE back of curb TO THE FACE OF THE GARAGE OR CARPORT STRUCTURE SUPPORT. SIDE ENTRY GARAGES

OR CARPORTS SHALL BE REQUIRED TO HAVE A MINIMUM 20 FOOT DRIVEWAY AS MEASURED FROM THE SIDEWALK, OR BACK OF CURB IF A SIDEWALK DOES NOT EXIST. A PARKED VEHICLE SHALL NOT IMPINGE UPON A SIDEWALK OR STREET.

2. Where a residential garage or carport is directly accessible from an alley, TRACT, EASEMENT OR PRIVATE DRIVE, it shall have a ~~minimum~~-paved APRON driveway not less than of 3 feet in length OR IT SHALL HAVE A PAVED ACCESS DRIVEWAY NOT LESS THAN 20 FEET IN LENGTH AS MEASURED FROM EDGE OF THE ALLEY, TRACT, EASEMENT OR PRIVATE DRIVE. IF A SIDEWALK IS INCLUDED IN THE ALLEY, TRACT, EASEMENT OR PRIVATE DRIVE CROSS-SECTION, THE ACCESS DRIVEWAY SHALL BE MEASURED FROM THE BACK OF SIDEWALK. A PARKED VEHICLE SHALL NOT IMPINGE UPON THE ALLEY, TRACT, EASEMENT OR PRIVATE DRIVE.

Planner Temes finished this portion of her presentation and asked for input from the Commission.

Comment: David Cavenee said he fully supports that clearance and the additional clarification in all of those locations.

Comment/Question: Joshua Oehler said that overall, he was in support of the changes, but his only issue is with cluster products. He said this has always been an issue. He said he knows that whenever a cluster product comes in front of them, they are always asking for more movement in these locations because the nature of a cluster product is that they want to make it as tight as possible. He asked to clarify that in defining the apron, they are saying that they could not go greater than 3'.

Answer: Amy Temes said if it's an apron that directly accesses into the garage, they are recommending 3' only.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he understands the desire to take away the temptation of parallel parking. However, he said he could see, without truly knowing all the details in a cluster product, this would be where it would be the most important to make sure that they have full turning radiuses and that they make sure that they have access and walkable routes. He said that was the issue that had come before them a couple of months ago. In that case, there was no way to access the back units without going through the driveway. He said they don't want to expect pedestrians to walk in the street. He said he worries a little about defining this at 3'. He said he likes that they are taking a look at this, but he thought they should consider looking at turning radiuses before making that determination.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked about defining the alleyway as a minimum of 20'.

Answer: Amy Temes said the driveway would be 20', but the alley has typically been 26'.



Question: Joshua Oehler said that normally when they do a street, they are at 24' to 25', so if they are at 26' he thinks that is fine.

Answer: Amy Temes said that she could do some more research on turning radiuses and provide some other examples.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he just wanted to make sure they weren't taking away the design ability to have a sidewalk to get to the back units.

Comment: Chair Sippel said he is very excited about these changes and clarifications, especially in relation to the cluster products.

Planner Temes then discussed the proposed changes to Minor Land Divisions and Minor Subdivisions. She indicated that Town Engineering Staff had recommended that a fourth type of Minor Land Divisions be added. She said this change refers to Lot Ties, where two existing lots are joined by the removal of a lot line. She said this is a standard engineering process, but for some reason, Town Code did not clearly discuss it. Regarding Minor Subdivisions, the Code currently references 10 and the Town Engineer suggested it be changed to 4 lots per parcel for a minor subdivision. The proposed changes are listed below:

### **Proposed Zoning Code Amendment**

Chapter III Subdivision Regulations, Article 1.2 Subdivisions Regulations, Section 1.201 Purpose and Applicability is hereby amended to read as follows (additions in ALL CAPS UNDERLINE; deletions in strikeout):

#### **1.201 Purpose and Applicability**

B. ***Applicability.*** This article sets forth the requirements for 2 types of land division:

1. ***Types.***

a. Minor Land Division. Each of the following shall be a minor land division subject to the requirements of this article:

- (1) The division of improved or unimproved land whose area is 2.5 acres or less into 2 or 3 lots or parcels for the purpose of sale or lease, where no new street is involved.
- (2) The division of improved or unimproved land for the purpose of sale, or lease, whether immediate or future, into 2 parts, where the boundaries of such property have been fixed by a recorded plat.
- (3) Lot line adjustments, whether or not a new lot is created.
- (4) LOT TIES, COMBINING TWO LOTS INTO A SINGLE LOT.

- b. **Minor Subdivision.** The division of improved or unimproved land of any size for the purpose of sale or lease, into ~~440~~ or fewer lots or parcels, whether or not a new street is involved.
2. **Exclusions.** This article does not apply to Subdivisions, other than Minor Subdivisions, pursuant to Chapter III, Article 1.1: Subdivision Regulations.

Planner Temes asked for input regarding this issue. Seeing no input, she proceeded with the next item to be addressed which was Use Permit Expiration Date. She said that previously the expiration time frame for Design Reviews/Standard Plans was increased to 3 years from 2 years. She indicated that Staff would also like to expand the Administrative, Special and Conditional Use Permits expiration timeframe from 2 to 3 years for consistency with the Design Review process. The proposed changes are noted below:

### **Proposed Zoning Code Amendment**

Chapter 1 Zoning Regulations, Division 5 Administration, Article 5.4 Use Permits, Section 5.404 Expiration, Modifications, Revocations is hereby amended to read as follows (additions in ALL CAPS UNDERLINE; deletions in strikeout):

### **5.404 Expiration; Modifications; Revocation**

- A. **Expiration.** A use permit shall automatically expire ~~32~~ years from its effective date unless either of the following has occurred:
  1. Commencement of the use, or
  2. Commencement of construction pursuant to a valid building permit.

Amy Temes finished her presentation. Chair Sippel called for comments. No additional comments were made.

### **3. DR17-1041: GILBERT MEMORIAL PARK AND FUNERAL HOME: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 10.57 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE CORNER OF QUEEN CREEK AND 156TH STREET, AND ZONED PUBLIC FACILITIES/INSTITUTIONAL (PF/I).**

Planner Ashlee MacDonald began her presentation on Gilbert Memorial Park and Funeral Home. She shared the location of the site at the north side of Queen Creek Road just east of the 156<sup>th</sup> Street alignment. She said that it sits near Perry High School. She said this is Town-owned land and she told the Commission that the Town went out seeking a cemetery project to locate within the Town and this is the result of that process. She said this project would use a portion of the Town-owned land. She indicated that the site was zoned Public Facilities/Institutional (PF/I). She said the overall site is 22 acres. The first phase is 10.5 acres. She indicated that the

cemetery does anticipate that the first phase will take 15-20 years before they need to expand and open up further land for burials. She said that a 7,000 square foot funeral home would be included in this first phase. She said the applicant has also provided elevations that show a Phase 2 to that funeral home that would increase the size to 9,000 square feet. This addition would include a banquet room and an extension of the patio to the rear. She discussed landscaping, noting that the bulk of the site would be landscaped and the applicant is far exceeding the requirement with 79% landscaping. Additionally, she said they are exceeding the required parking spaces. Planner MacDonald shared the overall site plan which includes the entire 22 acres. She pointed out that as the site develops the maintenance yard will relocate from the current location, where it will be close to the facilities they are maintaining, to the rear of the site. She discussed future access drives. She said she would anticipate that parking would occur along those drives as well, but she noted that there are 80 spaces dedicated and provided in the front of the funeral home. She said that the primary access was off of Queen Creek Road. She shared a secondary access point off of 156<sup>th</sup> Street. She said both of those access points will be gated after hours, but will remain open during the day. Planner MacDonald then discussed the existing berm along Queen Creek Road that will remain and create a very nice entry as you pull into the site. She shared the Landscape Plan, noting that they were providing significant trees, shrubs, succulents, and cacti, in keeping with their desert theme. She said that the applicant will be maintaining the lawn with reclaimed water, so she indicated the location of the pond. She said the applicant is working with the Water Resources department through that process.

Planner MacDonald pointed out the existing DG (decomposed granite) trail along the frontage of the property that the applicant will be relocating and required to maintain. She asked for feedback from the Commission on the treatment of Phase 2. She said the applicant has proposed a meadow mix hydroseed at the rear of the property and Staff has expressed some concerns about this choice and would like the Commission's feedback. She said she asked for a breakdown of the seeds that they would be using within that meadow mix and a lot of it would be grasses, with some fertile brush. She indicated that Staff is concerned that if it isn't properly maintained, it could turn to weeds and become a fire hazard. She then shared the elevations and told the Commission that Staff is really pleased with the clean lines and modern design of the building. She said they are using desert tones of stucco with accents and significant portions of glass. She shared the use of an overhang which would provide shade to the glass windows. She said they have also provided elevations for Phase 2 of the development. She highlighted the areas that would be included in Phase 1 and those that would be included in Phase 2. Planner MacDonald shared the floor plan and the colors and materials. She said they are proposing site walls throughout the project. She then finished her presentation and asked for comments or questions from the Commission, specifically about the use of the meadow mix hydroseed.

Question: David Cavenee asked if Planner MacDonald could bring up the map that shows the second phase. He said he wanted to better understand the phasing. He asked if the 22.41 acres represented the entire parcel or if that was just Phase 1.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald said that the entire property is 22.41 acres. Phase 1 is roughly 10.57 acres.

Question: David Cavenee clarified that the first phase was only a portion of the 22 acres.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald answered affirmatively.

Question: David Cavenee asked for clarification that the applicant didn't expect to expand beyond the limits of this parcel.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald answered that they did not.

Question: David Cavenee mentioned the berm along the front. He asked if there were any other grading anomalies within this property. He asked if the property rises significantly to the north or anything like that.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald said that she did not believe so. She said she could look into that further to verify that it did not.

Comment/Question: David Cavenee said the reason he asked, was that if they are going to do a hydroseed mix of some kind, it might change the tone and tenor of what it would look like, if there is some elevation change. If it is just flat former farmland, then it could probably turn into more of a weed mix. He asked if the property was raw dirt or if it was currently landscaped in any fashion.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald answered that there was landscaping on the berm, but towards the rear of the site, there is no landscaping.

Question: David Cavenee asked if it would be too onerous to ask them to landscape the entire parcel now.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald answered affirmatively.

Comment: David Cavenee said he agreed with Staff that some of those pasture mixes can be pretty rough. He said he had actually planted some of that himself and he said it is a very rough mix. He thought they might suggest they use a hydroseed mix with more of a grass content, rather than a wild mixture. He said he knows they make some with more of a consistent mix, even though they are a little more expensive. He said he would recommend that and would be happy to help on that research if that was needed. He said leaving it raw dirt wouldn't look good.

Comment: Chair Sippel suggested that they might look at 3 to 7 feet of grass, and then have it shoot off into something else. He assumes they don't want to leave it the way it is now due to dust. He said he would agree with Staff regarding it being a weed and fire concern.

Question: David Cavenee asked if the second phase of the building was aligned to plan with the expansion of the field portion.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald said that the second phase of the building could take place earlier.

Question: David Cavenee asked if she had any idea what would trigger that happening sooner.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald said she wasn't given a specific reason, but she thinks the applicant just wants to begin slowly and make sure the business is growing properly before they invest in that extra square footage.

Question: David Cavenee asked about the thinking that the current scenario will last 15-20 years and wondered if that was referring to Phase 1 only.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald answered affirmatively.

Comment: David Cavenee said that in that case, this particular cemetery could theoretically (and given all the additional space) last for 30 to 60 plus years.

Question: David Cavenee asked if 156<sup>th</sup> Street is an extended road or if it would cut right there at their entrance. He said it almost looks like the road ends right past their entrance.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald said that they will be doing improvements up to that gated entrance at the time of the first phase and then as future phases develop they will look at developing the remainder of that.

Question: David Cavenee asked if anyone else used the road north of them.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald said no one is currently using the road.

Question: David Cavenee asked if the high school is kitty corner from the site.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald again answered affirmatively.

Question: David Cavenee asked if the high school had any concerns or if they anticipated any impacts to or from the high school.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald said they haven't heard any concerns from them. As part of the process when the Town was first seeking the cemetery site within the Town, they did a number of open houses. She said she had read through some of those minutes and she didn't see any concerns raised by the school.

Question: Greg Froehlich asked about the access on Queen Creek Road. He asked if there was a median or if it was full access off of Queen Creek.

Answer: Ashlee MacDonald said she would need to double check, but she believes it is full access.

Comment: Greg Froehlich said he thought it would be best if Queen Creek was full access. He said he could see that 156<sup>th</sup> Street might be more of a minor entrance or exit from the property. He said he didn't have anything extra to add regarding the seeding, but it does concern him. He said that the building looks great and has great articulation.

**4. DR17-01079, RIVULON COMMONS: SITE PLAN, LANDSCAPE, GRADING AND DRAINAGE, ELEVATIONS, FLOOR PLANS, LIGHTING, COLORS AND MATERIALS FOR APPROXIMATELY 32.67 ACRES, GENERALLY LOCATED AT THE WEST OF SOUTHWEST CORNER OF LINDSAY ROAD AND PECOS ROAD AND ZONED BUSINESS PARK (BP) WITH A PLANNED AREA DEVELOPMENT (PAD) OVERLAY.**

Bob Caravona stated that he was very happy to be presenting on DR17-1079, Rivulon Commons tonight. He said this indicates that the project is going extremely well. He said they are nearly

built out with Rivulon's District 1 and District 2. He said tonight the Commission will be seeing the development move inward. The developer is now proposing development east of the Districts beginning with Rivulon Commons – a three phase project consisting of four two-story office buildings. He said he would like feedback regarding the site plan, architecture, and the possibility of CD's At-Risk. He said that Staff supports this request. He shared the Vicinity Map, indicating that the site location is internal to the Rivulon site and located just south of Pecos Road, between Gilbert Road and Lindsay Road. He indicated the location of the primary access points for the first phase would be along Rivulon Boulevard. He reminded the Commission that the Lindsay interchange has not been constructed yet. He informed the Commission that there would also be access from Pecos Road. He said the site is located in the Business Park (BP) zoning district and it has a Planned Area Development (PAD) overlay. He said this is consistent with the zoning to the east, west and south of the site. He said there is residential zoning just north of Pecos Road. He said the proposal meets all minimum setback requirements. He said they also meet the landscape requirements, with 23% of a required 15%. He shared a slide that indicated the three phases of development associated with the project. He said Phase 1 was highlighted in blue and included Building A. He said that Building A is roughly 99,000 square feet. He said the second phase will be Building B, which is highlighted in red and will be approximately 104,000 square feet. The third phase has identical buildings, but they are located just to the west.

Planner Caravona stated that there are six points of access to the site. He said these access points will occur at build-out. He reminded the Commission that the first phase will have two points of access at Rivulon Boulevard. He shared the way in which internal circulation would work on the site. He stated that the blue lines on his slide show the main spines that travel through the site at build-out. He indicated the four major parking fields were shown with yellow and green arrows. He said you would enter from the south and move up forward through the site. He pointed out the main entrance is from Rivulon Boulevard and that is the welcome mat to this project. He said they will have a very formalized entry monument to the main entrance. He also noted that there is a curvilinear road through the north/south movement to provide traffic calming. He said the curving of the road would slow down traffic. He also discussed the crosswalks to the site, noting that there are five crosswalks, all strategically located. Planner Caravona said that this project is guided towards millennials. He said the juxtaposition of this building is to encourage collaboration. The interior area between the buildings is designed to be a collaborative area where those that work in the buildings can meet in the common areas. He said there will be some amenities in that area to help make it conducive to meeting with colleagues.

Planner Caravona shared the Landscape Plan and shared that Rivulon is known for their lush landscaping. He said Staff has been wowed by the amount of plant material that has been included in the Landscape Plan. He said they are providing 10 different species of trees, 19 different shrubs, 4 ground covers, 8 cacti, 10 accent plants and 1 vine species. He shared some sketches the applicant had provided of how this landscape would look. He said they have foundation landscape, landscape along the roads, and they also have landscape islands throughout the parking area. He also stated that the parking lot has both covered and uncovered parking. In terms of parking and screen walls, Planner Caravona shared that along Rivulon Boulevard, they have a combination of screen walls which are 2' CMU, 4' trellis and 3' x 6'

stone screen wall. He said this provides a great variation along Rivulon Boulevard. He said that there is a 25' SRP easement to the north along Pecos Road. He pointed out that there is also an 8' PUE easement. He said due to these easements, SRP has limitations on the plant material that is allowed to be placed in that area and does not allow structures at all. He said that they cannot have parking or screen walls within those easements. He said the applicant has come up with a good solution and they have created a 3' high landscaped berm along Pecos Road. He said they would also see some tall transmission lines in that SRP easement. He said the applicant has had to work with SRP to determine if parking might be made available in that easement. He said that it is his understanding as of today, that they have been able to come to an agreement with SRP. He informed the Commission that Staff was very pleased with the elevations. He said they have used tilt-up construction. They have 8" and 2" reveals, as well as veneers over the tilt-up. He said they have a variation on the tile veneers wherein they vary the patterns with 24" x 48" tiles intermixed with 12" x 24" tiles. He said this provides a good variation to the wall mass. He also discussed colors and materials, noting that the color board was providing to the Commissioners in their packets. Planner Caravona finished his presentation and asked for any questions or comments from the Commission. He informed the Commission that Staff supports the CD's At-Risk.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked to clarify that it looked like just south of the buildings, there were some turning radiuses within the parking areas that are hatched out. He said he is curious why. He said they are just south of the buildings.

Answer: Bob Caravona answered that those are actually loading zones for Fed-Ex, UPS or other deliveries.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he appreciates the inner courtyards and the accessible feel to the space and thinks they have done a good job on the site plan. He said if those are the loading zones, it seems those might be more centralized, but he acknowledged that this may be due to their protocols.

Response: Bob Caravona said they have talked about different locations of the loading zones and the developer feels that these are the appropriate locations. He said there are a total of four loading zones altogether. He said that each of the buildings has a loading zone.

Question: Joshua Oehler asked about the speed tables that were in between the buildings to help slow down the traffic. He said at one point, due to the large landscaping, it makes a hard turnaround through that landscaping. He asked what the idea was behind that large rectangular piece of landscaping.

Answer: Bob Caravona said that there are two reasons for that traffic island. First, it is to slow down traffic and second, it is used to buffer and add screening to the power lines.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he knows that they have parking lots like this, in which awkward turns are required and he feels that this design has some pretty quick turns required to get across the site. He thought it would definitely slow down traffic, but he thinks it will make it hard to deal with traffic in that area. He said you will have to stop at one turn, stop at another turn and do a full turnaround in that area.

Response: Bob Caravona thanked Commissioner Oehler for his comment. He said that Staff had been discussing this with the applicant to make sure all the different movements allow for safe movement through the site. He said they may need to address some of these concerns.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he just thinks that instead of making four turns, they could just go straight through and then stop, and avoid making the extra two turns.

Comment/Question: David Cavenee said he is also troubled by the rectangle and the hard turns there. He said it seems like a roundabout would be more appropriate if they are trying to protect some trees. He said he thinks this is an unusual design element that he isn't a fan of. He also said that one of the things that strikes him when looking at the site plan, is the effort to interrupt that view and that thoroughfare, but in the case of the horizontal lines in front of the building, those drive aisles are not interrupted. They are just long and straight, uninteresting lines. He thinks this site needs a little more interest. He said he could see himself standing in front of one of those buildings, looking east and west, and feeling like he was in an industrial park, rather than in a nice office park. He also asked why the red horizontal line between the buildings stop at that center point and doesn't continue across the east. He asked if it was due to a different treatment between the buildings on that side.

Answer: Bob Caravona said that the traffic island they are seeing today may come into a different form the next time the Commission sees it. He said that it may be shortened up a bit or the shape may be shifted. He said that in terms of the red line, that is actually the phase line.

Question: David Cavenee asked to clarify that it was a phase line and not a walking path.

Answer: Bob Caravona said it was a phase line. However, he said that there are walking paths between the buildings from east to west and that there would be future connections to the adjacent properties when the development comes forth.

Question: David Cavenee again asked about the long, linear drive aisles in front of the buildings, noting that there is no interest at all and they look like long straight runs. He thought they could have placed the buildings on the site in a little bit more of an interesting fashion. He said he understands that they are trying to maximize parking, but he sees the need to create more interest in this layout. He also asked if the covered parking was marked.

Answer: Bob Caravona said that he did not have an elevation that showed the location of the covered parking.

Question: David Cavenee asked if the covered parking was on the edges or if it was up close to the buildings.

Answer: Bob Caravona said that the covered parking is in various spots and that they are providing roughly 50% covered parking and 50% uncovered. He said if Commissioner Cavenee looks into the detail, he will be able to see where these canopies are located.

Comment/Question: David Cavenee said that coverage was great, especially in Arizona, but he said it diminishes the landscaping opportunities. He said they want to make sure they keep it soft. He asked if Bob Caravona could continue through some of his slides until he found the one he was interested in. He then discussed one of the slides. He stated that these are great office



buildings, but that they are very linear, without a lot of interruption. He said when he looks at the roofline, he sees a very consistent parapet height. He said it would be nice if there was a little more interest there. He said he was also curious about how they were hiding their mechanicals. He said he didn't see any penthouse equipment or screens. He said it would be important to know how they are screening these mechanicals. He suggested they improve the elevations a little bit with a bit more fenestration and a little more variation in the horizontal lines. He thought this would improve the look and feel.

Question: Greg Froehlich said he had a couple of questions regarding phasing. He said it looks like Phase 1 is being constructed in the lower left. He asked which roads were being constructed with Phase 1.

Answer: Bob Caravona said that Rivulon Boulevard has an application in now for that roadway design. He said that is being currently reviewed. He said that Pecos Road, to the north, has been built-out. Internally, he noted that they will have their main entrance for Phase 1 and he indicated the location of a second entrance. He also stated that they would have the parking fields and associated drive aisles.

Question: Greg Froehlich asked to clarify that they will not connect in with Pecos, but would end it where Phase 1 ends.

Answer: Bob Caravona answered affirmatively.

Comment: Mary Harris said it appears to be a bit more of a winding road through the site. She said as a user, especially of an unfamiliar site, she would prefer to have a straight line of sight to where it is that she needs to go. She said she would prefer that the road not wind and that she could see where her destination is.

Comment: Joshua Oehler said he wanted to discuss the turnarounds. He said he sees the sidewalk that is created to connect them all together. He said in Phase 1, it is buffered by one side. He said it feels awkward to have the sidewalk just kind of running through the parking lot. He said he understands that they are trying to connect the covered parking and ADA, but that's only on one side. He said that he suggested they not have that within a landscape island, even if it meant losing a car, so they could create a more protected walkway, instead of it is just being in the actual parking lot. He said it doesn't look like it has any protection, but is just one-sided by the landscape. Additionally, he said it looks like there is a main sidewalk that connects to Building A. He said you have the sidewalk that carries you out and then you are into the parking lot where they have a larger landscape island in the middle. He said it looks like they need more connection north to south there. He also said he agrees with Commissioner Cavenee regarding the buildings. He said they are large and he realizes that makes it hard to create a lot of movement in a tilt-up building, but he thinks it is really plain. He thinks adding a little more movement would be a good idea. He said they have these really long runs without any breakup. He said you would expect some of that, but he thinks they could do a little better with the design and trying to break up those horizontal lines in a building of this size. Lastly, he said he also agrees with Commissioner Cavenee, that the parking lots are rather dull. He said he didn't know how much they could break it up. He said it wasn't a good idea to get too complicated in these parking lots and require people to make too many turns. He said he thinks this design will work

great for internal use, but he would like to see what the landscaping could be in an effort to give the street view a little more interest. He said although it is nice that they have this nice internal, protected zone for the employees, from the outside, it is just a sea of cars that are being looked at.

Question: Chair Sippel asked Bob Caravona if the applicant was requesting CD's At-Risk.

Answer: Bob Caravona answered affirmatively.

Question: Chair Sippel asked how comfortable Planner Caravona was in his ability to take the info the Commission had shared tonight, and ask the applicant to make some of the changes they have suggested.

Answer: Bob Caravona said he felt comfortable with the architectural elements. He said he was less certain about some of the comments that Commissioner Cavenee had raised about adding variation to the roofline. He said they have an additional 1' they can raise up. He said Staff would not accept CD's At-Risk if they don't feel comfortable that the comments of the Commissioners and Staff have been addressed. He said they would have another submittal to make.

Chair Sippel said that he was comfortable with that. He thanked Planner Caravona for his presentation and moved on to the next item on the agenda.

## **5. Discussion of Regular Meeting Agenda**

Chair Sippel requested that Item #14, DR17-1016, ARC Gilbert be moved to the Consent Calendar because they were just requesting a continuance. He also suggested that Item #16, ST17-1006, Cooley Station Parcels 10 and 17 Western Pacific be moved to the Consent Agenda. He asked if anyone else had any changes to make to the Regular Meeting Agenda.

## **ADJOURN STUDY SESSION**

Seeing no other changes to the agenda, Chair Sippel advised the Commission that they would need one alternate to participate during the Regular Meeting. He requested that Seth Banda remain on the dais for the Regular Meeting. Chair Sippel adjourned the Study Session at 6:01 p.m. and said that they would begin the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission after a 5-minute break.

---

Kristofer Sippel, Chairman

ATTEST:

---

Debbie Frazey, Recording Secretary

Town of Gilbert Planning Commission  
Study Session August 2, 2017